

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama, U.S. Pat. No. 6,473,812 in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary (fifth edition). The Examiner's rejection is traversed for the following reason.

Applicant discloses an automatic analysis apparatus that includes an analysis unit to analyze objects. The apparatus also includes a mail creation unit that creates an e-mail based on any defect detected by the analysis unit and a reception unit that receives control e-mails from a person in charge of the analysis unit. A data extraction unit for extracting data from the control e-mail and a control unit to control the analysis unit based on the extracted data are also included. The apparatus automatically sends the notification e-mail to the person in charge. The person in charge can then correct the defect by selecting a choice from multiple choices contained in the notification e-mail and transmitting the choice in the form of the control e-mail back to the analysis unit.

Motoyama '812, the Microsoft Computer Dictionary or the combination thereof do not teach all the features of claim 1. More specifically, Motoyama '812, the Microsoft Computer Dictionary or the combination thereof do not teach "wherein the person in charge can cure the defect by selecting a choice from a plurality of choices contained in the notification e-mail and transmitting the choice in the control e-mail

to the analysis unit.”

Regarding Motoyama '812, Motoyama '812 discloses a system including a remote monitoring device and a monitored device. The monitoring device monitors, controls and diagnoses the operation of the monitored device. The monitored device is an office business machine, such as a copier, printer, facsimile, etc. The monitoring device requests parameter information from the monitored device, such as image density, to determine if that parameter needs to be changed (see column 9, line 50 through column 10, line 5). Motoyama '812, thus, discloses a system whereby the remote monitoring device can change a parameter (e.g. image density) of the monitored device. Motoyama '812, however, does not disclose that in the event of a defect the monitored device sends a notification e-mail to the monitoring device, whereby the notification e-mail contains multiple choices to cure the defect. Further, Motoyama '812 does not disclose transmitting the choice in a control e-mail back to the monitored device. Motoyama '812 simply teaches a system that monitors and diagnosis office business machines and changes a parameter accordingly.

Regarding the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, the Examiner cites the Microsoft Computer Dictionary to merely define a LAN.

Based on the foregoing, it is apparent that Motoyama '812, the Microsoft Computer Dictionary or the combination thereof do not teach all the features of claim 1. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claim 1 upon the Motoyama '812 and the Microsoft Computer Dictionary references are hereby requested.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, thus, all arguments pertaining to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 2 and are herein incorporated by reference.

Claim 5 has been amended to include similar features to those incorporated into claim 1. Thus, all the above arguments pertaining to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 5 and are herein incorporated by reference.

Claim 6 has been cancelled.

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama, U.S. Pat. No. 6,473,812 in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary (fifth edition) as applied above, and in further view of Motoyama U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2003/0055952. The Examiner's rejection is traversed for the following reason.

Applicant notes that claims 3 and 4 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, thus, all arguments pertaining to claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 3 and 4 and are herein incorporated by reference. Further, Applicant notes that Motoyama '952 does not correct or eliminate the deficiencies of the primary reference, Motoyama '812, as they relate to claim 1. Motoyama '952 discloses a system for monitoring networked devices, such as, a copier, a facsimile, a scanner, a printer, a server or other business office machine, see paragraph [0062]. Motoyama '952 does not, however, teach or suggest the two-way communication between the analysis unit and the person in charge nor does it teach the defect curing features as defined in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 3 and 4 are allowable over the proposed combination of the references.

In regard to new claim 7, neither Motoyama '812 nor Motoyama '952 teach "wherein the control unit stops the operation of the analysis unit upon the detection

of the defect.”

Motoyama '812 discloses a system for monitoring, controlling and diagnosing the operation of an office business machine, such as a copier, printer, facsimile, etc. (see abstract). Motoyama '812 also discloses that the system is capable of remotely changing a parameter (e.g. image density) of the machine, see column 9, line 60 through column 10, line 5. Motoyama '812, however, does not disclose that the system can remotely stop the operation of the machine in the event a defect is detected. Thus, Motoyama '812 teaches a system that monitors and diagnosis office business machines but does not have the capability remotely stop the operation of the machine.

Motoyama '952 discloses a system for monitoring networked devices, such as, a copier, a facsimile, a scanner, a printer, a server or other business office machine, see paragraph [0062]. Motoyama '952, however, does not disclose that the system can remotely stop the operation of the machine in the event a defect is detected. Thus, Motoyama '952 teaches a system that monitors and diagnosis networked devices but does not have the capability remotely stop the operation of the devices.

In regard to new claims 8 and 9, neither Motoyama '812 nor Motoyama '952 teach “wherein the analyzing unit comprises a liquid chromatograph.” Motoyama '812 discloses a system for monitoring, controlling and diagnosing the operation of an office business machine, such as a copier, a printer, a facsimile, etc. (see abstract). Motoyama '952 discloses a system for monitoring networked devices, such as, a copier, a facsimile, a scanner, a printer, a server or other business office machine, see paragraph [0062]. Thus, neither Motoyama '812 nor Motoyama '952

teach a liquid chromatograph. Therefore, neither Motoyama '812 nor Motoyama '952 teach all the features of new claims 8 and 9.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. NGB-15410.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By /Ronald S. Nolan/
Ronald S. Nolan, Reg. No. 59271
Patent Agent

4080 Erie Street
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7836
(216) 566-9700